

PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP  
44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2450  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104

1 BRUCE L. SIMON (Bar No. 96241)  
bsimon@pswlaw.com  
2 BENJAMIN E. SHIFTAN (Bar No. 265767)  
bshiftan@pswlaw.com  
3 **PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP**  
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 2450  
4 San Francisco, California 94104  
Telephone: (415) 433-9000  
5 Facsimile: (415) 433-9008  
  
6 CHRISTOPHER B. DOLAN (Bar No. 165358)  
chris@cdblaw.com  
7 **THE DOLAN LAW FIRM**  
1438 Market Street  
8 San Francisco, California 94102  
Telephone: (415) 421-2800  
9 Facsimile: (415) 421-2830  
  
10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

13 L.A. Taxi Cooperative, Inc. dba Yellow Cab  
Co.; Administrative Services SD, LLC dba  
14 Yellow Radio Service; All Yellow Taxi, Inc.  
dba Metro Cab; American Cab, LLC;  
15 American Cab, LLC dba Pomona Valley  
Yellow Cab; Bell Cab Company, Inc.; TM-  
16 MTM, Inc.; Big Dog City Corporation dba  
Citywide Dispatch, Citywide Taxi, and Big  
17 Dog Cab; Cabco Yellow, Inc. dba California  
Yellow Cab; C&J Leasing, Inc. dba Royal  
18 Taxi; G&S Transit Management, Inc.; Gorgee  
Enterprises, Inc.; LA City Cab, LLC; Long  
19 Beach Yellow Cab Co-operative, Inc.;  
Network Paratransit Systems, Inc.; South Bay  
20 Co-operative, Inc. dba United Checker Cab;  
Taxi Leasing, Inc. dba Yellow Cab of Ventura  
21 County; Tri-City Transportation Systems, Inc.;  
Tri Counties Transit Corporation dba Blue  
22 Dolphin Cab of Santa Barbara, Yellow Cab of  
Santa Maria, and Yellow Cab of San Luis  
23 Obispo; and Yellow Cab of South Bay Co-  
operative, Inc. dba South Bay Yellow Cab,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 vs.

26 Uber Technologies, Inc.; Rasier, LLC; and  
27 Rasier-CA, LLC,

28 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:15-cv-01257-JST

**PLAINTIFF ADMINISTRATIVE  
SERVICES SD, LLC DBA YELLOW  
RADIO SERVICE'S RESPONSES TO  
DEFENDANT UBER TECHNOLOGIES,  
INC.'S SECOND SET OF  
INTERROGATORIES**

1 PROPOUNDING PARTY: DEFENDANT UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

2 RESPONDING PARTY: PLAINTIFF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES SD, LLC DBA  
3 YELLOW RADIO SERVICE

4 SET NO.: TWO

5 **I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

6 All answers contained herein are based only upon such information and documents  
7 presently available and specifically known to Plaintiff Administrative Services SD, LLC dba  
8 Yellow Radio Service ("Plaintiff"). In addition, further independent discovery, independent  
9 investigation, legal research and/or analysis may supply additional facts and/or add meaning to the  
10 known facts. The responses hereinafter set forth are given without prejudice to Plaintiff's right at  
11 trial to produce evidence of any subsequently discovered fact or facts that may later develop.

12 **II. GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

13 Plaintiff objects generally to the Interrogatories on the following grounds, each of which is  
14 incorporated by reference in the responses to the individual Interrogatories below. All responses  
15 set forth herein are subject to and without waiver of any of these General Objections:

16 1. Plaintiff objects to each interrogatory, instruction or definition that purports to  
17 impose obligations on Plaintiff greater than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil  
18 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

19 2. Plaintiff objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they are compound,  
20 conjunctive, or disjunctive.

21 3. Plaintiff objects to each Interrogatory, instruction or definition to the extent that it  
22 calls for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work  
23 product doctrine, and/or is otherwise privileged or protected from discovery.

24 4. Plaintiff objects to each Interrogatory to the extent that it fails to state with  
25 sufficient particularity the information and categories of information to be provided.

26 5. Plaintiff objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek to require Plaintiff to  
27 produce all information that supports or otherwise relates to specific contentions in this litigation,  
28 on the grounds that such contention interrogatories are unduly burdensome and premature at this

1 stage of the litigation.

2 6. Plaintiff objects to the Interrogatories, as well as the definitions and instructions, to  
3 the extent the information requested is not relevant to a party's claim or defense and/or is not  
4 proportional to the needs of the case.

5 7. Plaintiff objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they, or any portion of  
6 them, seek information within the possession, custody, or control of any Defendant, or of publicly  
7 available information such that the information is obtainable from some other source that is more  
8 convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive, or the production of the information will impose  
9 undue burden, inconvenience, or expense upon Plaintiff.

10 8. In responding to these Interrogatories, Plaintiff does not in any way waive or intend  
11 to waive any privilege or objection, but rather intends to preserve and is preserving the following:

12 a) all objections as to the relevancy, materiality, and admissibility of any information  
13 sought by any Interrogatory;

14 b) all objections as to vagueness, ambiguity or other infirmity in the form of the  
15 Interrogatories and any objections based on the undue burden imposed by the Interrogatories and  
16 each individual Interrogatory contained therein;

17 c) all rights to object on any grounds to the use of any of the responses, or their subject  
18 matter, in any subsequent proceedings, including the trial of this or any other action;

19 d) all rights to object on any grounds to any further Interrogatories or other discovery  
20 requests involving or related to the subject matter of the Interrogatories;

21 e) the right to supplement responses to the Interrogatories prior to trial; and

22 f) any and all privileges and/or rights under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or other  
23 statutes, guidelines or case law.

### 24 **III. OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS**

25 1. Plaintiff objects to the definition of the term "STATE THE BASIS" as overly broad  
26 and burdensome. Plaintiff further objects to the extent that this definition calls for privileged  
27 and/or protected information. In addition, Plaintiff objects to the extent that this definition seeks  
28 information outside of Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control. Plaintiff's responses to the

1 Interrogatories are based on information in Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control, excluding  
2 information in the sole possession of Plaintiff's counsel obtained during pre-filing investigation  
3 and over the course of this litigation. Plaintiff further objects to this definition to the extent that it  
4 seeks to impose more than is required by the provisions under the Federal Rules of Civil  
5 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

6       2. Plaintiff objects to the definition of "COMMUNICATION" as overly broad and  
7 burdensome. Plaintiff further objects to the extent that this definition calls for privileged and/or  
8 protected information. In addition, Plaintiff objects to the extent that this definition seeks  
9 information outside of Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control. Plaintiff's responses to the  
10 Interrogatories are based on information in Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control, excluding  
11 information in the sole possession of Plaintiff's counsel obtained during pre-filing investigation  
12 and over the course of this litigation. Plaintiff further objects to this definition to the extent that it  
13 seeks to impose more than is required by the provisions under the Federal Rules of Civil  
14 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

15       3. Plaintiff objects to the definition of "DOCUMENT" as overly broad and  
16 burdensome. Plaintiff further objects to the extent that this definition calls for privileged and/or  
17 protected information. In addition, Plaintiff objects to the extent that this definition seeks  
18 information outside of Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control. Plaintiff's responses to the  
19 Interrogatories are based on information in Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control, excluding  
20 information in the sole possession of Plaintiff's counsel obtained during pre-filing investigation  
21 and over the course of this litigation. Plaintiff further objects to this definition to the extent that it  
22 seeks to impose more than is required by the provisions under the Federal Rules of Civil  
23 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

24       4. Plaintiff objects to the definition of the terms "YOU" and "YOUR" as overly broad  
25 and burdensome. Plaintiff further objects to the extent that this definition calls for privileged  
26 and/or protected information. In addition, Plaintiff objects to the extent that this definition seeks  
27 information outside of Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control. Plaintiff's responses to the  
28 Interrogatories are based on information in Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control, excluding

1 information in the sole possession of Plaintiff's counsel obtained during pre-filing investigation  
 2 and over the course of this litigation. Plaintiff further objects to this definition to the extent that it  
 3 seeks to impose more than is required by the provisions under the Federal Rules of Civil  
 4 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

5         5. Plaintiff objects to the definition of the term "RELATING TO" as overly broad and  
 6 burdensome. Plaintiff further objects to the extent that this definition calls for privileged and/or  
 7 protected information. In addition, Plaintiff objects to the extent that this definition seeks  
 8 information outside of Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control. Plaintiff's responses to the  
 9 Interrogatories are based on information in Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control, excluding  
 10 information in the sole possession of Plaintiff's counsel obtained during pre-filing investigation  
 11 and over the course of this litigation. Plaintiff further objects to this definition to the extent that it  
 12 seeks to impose more than is required by the provisions under the Federal Rules of Civil  
 13 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

14                     **RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES, SET TWO**

15         **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

16             Please precisely identify the geographic area where YOU offer taxi cab services, and if that  
 17 area has changed from March 2009 to present, please specifically identify the changes.

18         **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

19             Plaintiff incorporates by reference the Preliminary Statement, General Objections, and  
 20 Objections to Definitions set forth above. Plaintiff further objects to the extent that the  
 21 information sought is protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work product  
 22 doctrine, and/or is otherwise privileged and/or protected from discovery. Plaintiff further objects  
 23 to the extent the information is publically available and, thus, equally available to the Defendants.  
 24 Plaintiff further objects to the phrases "precisely," "specifically," and "the geographic area where  
 25 YOU offer taxi cab services" as vague and ambiguous. The use of the terms "precisely" and  
 26 "specifically" renders this request unduly burdensome. Plaintiff will respond with the specificity  
 27 required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing  
 28 orders, and orders of this Court.

1 Subject to and without waiving all general and specific objections, Plaintiff responds as  
2 follows:

3 Administrative Services SD, LLC provides taxi cab services within the County of San  
4 Diego, excluding the City of Coronado.

5 DATED: December 7, 2015

*/s/ Benjamin E. Shiftan*

6 BRUCE L. SIMON (Bar No. 96241)

bsimon@pswlaw.com

7 BENJAMIN E. SHIFTAN (Bar No. 265767)

bshiftan@pswlaw.com

8 **PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP**

44 Montgomery Street, Suite 2450

9 San Francisco, California 94104

Telephone: (415) 433-9000

10 Facsimile: (415) 433-9008

11 CHRISTOPHER B. DOLAN (Bar No. 165358)

chris@cbdlaw.com

12 **THE DOLAN LAW FIRM**

1438 Market Street

13 San Francisco, California 94102

Telephone: (415) 421-2800

14 Facsimile: (415) 421-2830

15 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP  
44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2450  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104

VERIFICATION

I, Anthony Palmeri, declare:

I hereby state that I am President of Administrative Services SD, LLC dba Yellow Radio Service. I am authorized to make this verification on behalf of Administrative Services SD, LLC dba Yellow Radio Service in this action.

I have read the foregoing PLAINTIFF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES SD, LLC DBA YELLOW RADIO SERVICE'S RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES and hereby declare that the responses are true to and correct to the best of my personal knowledge, information, and belief, with the exception of those matters upon which I have relied on the investigation of counsel, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. I reserve my right to supplement or revise this statement based upon any subsequently discovered documents or information.

Executed at SAN DIEGO, CA on DEC. 2, 2015.

  
Anthony Palmeri